

Message

From: Laws, Meredith [Laws.Meredith@epa.gov]
Sent: 3/2/2017 11:00:59 PM
To: Goodis, Michael [Goodis.Michael@epa.gov]
Subject: another story
Attachments: R089-026 Curfew Sec 24c FL-990014 Turf 25May11f.doc

Mike – here's a link to another news story on the telone situation. Mr. Lawson, who wrote to Senator Nelson, is named in the story. Fortunately he did not say anything bad about EPA. This is in case you may want to mention it to Sherada.

meredith

From: Hathaway, Margaret
Sent: Thursday, March 02, 2017 4:21 PM
To: Smith, Charles <Smith.Charles@epa.gov>; Daiker, Dave <Davis.Daiker@freshfromflorida.com>
Cc: Overstreet, Anne <overstreet.anne@epa.gov>; Costello, Kevin <Costello.Kevin@epa.gov>; Laws, Meredith <Laws.Meredith@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: 1,3-D Tampa Bay Golf Course Fumigation

Thanks Billy. Yes, that article you cite is the correct story. The concerned citizen Robert Lawson mentioned in the article has been in touch with RD, and Debra McCormack from the same area (mentioned in this [other article](#)) has called me multiple times this week. Dave, I am OPP's Chemical Review Manager for 1,3-D.

I believe the language raising public concern is from the May 2011 version of SLN FL990014 (Curfew), which is based on Section 3 label 62719-32 (Telone II). The Section 3 label calls for a 100 ft setback from "occupied structures." The FL SLN label does not mention this 100 ft setback (though it does discuss 100 ft setbacks from wells and karst topographical features), but does require that "a buffer zone of at least 30 feet around each application area must be established."

Dow AgroSciences claimed in a phone call today that FL applicators of Curfew need to follow the 100 ft federal setback from occupied structures from the Section 3 label and also post signs 30 ft from the edge of the treated area. However, the public seems to be interpreting the FL SLN language to mean that the 100 ft buffer from occupied structures has been reduced to a 30 ft buffer, and wants to know why. They also don't like that the setback is from "occupied structures" rather than property lines.

Thanks,
Meg

Attachment: May 2011 version of FL990014 label

Margaret Hathaway (Meg)
Chemical Review Manager
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
OCSPP: Office of Pesticide Programs
Pesticide Re-Evaluation Division RMIB II
hathaway.margaret@epa.gov
(703) 305-5076

From: Smith, Charles
Sent: Thursday, March 02, 2017 3:26 PM
To: Daiker, Dave <Davis.Daiker@freshfromflorida.com>

Cc: Hathaway, Margaret <Hathaway.Margaret@epa.gov>

Subject: 1,3-D Tampa Bay Golf Course Fumigation

Davis,

Sorry to bother you two times in one week. The Chemical Review Manager for 1,3-D (Meg Hathaway) has been receiving a number of calls from individuals around the potential use of 1,3-D on a Tampa Bay golf course. I assume it is related to this course <http://events.tbo.com/news/environment/pesticide-meeting-highlights-ties-between-forest-hills-babe-zaharias-golf/2314080>. In any case, in looking at this Meg found that it appeared that there was a FL SLN that did not specifically reference the 100 ft 1,3-D buffer.

Two questions arose for us:

- 1) We assume you are aware of this situation and may also be fielding calls? We want to be sure that we are on the same page in terms of the info we are relaying.
- 2) Are we misinterpreting the FL SLN label regarding the buffer zone?

Any info you can give us on this situation would be much appreciated. Thanks!

Charles " Billy" Smith
Acting Associate Division Director
Pesticide Reevaluation Division
Office of Pesticide Programs
703-305-0291